ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA309554 10/02/2009

Filing date:

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	92048667
Party	Plaintiff Jules Jurgensen/Rhapsody, Inc.
Correspondence Address	STUART E. BECK THE BECK LAW FIRM 1500 WALNUT STREET, SUITE 700 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102-3504 UNITED STATES BeckPatent@aol.com
Submission	Other Motions/Papers
Filer's Name	Stuart E. Beck
Filer's e-mail	BeckPatent@aol.com
Signature	/Stuart E. Beck/
Date	10/02/2009
Attachments	09-10-02 JJ's Response to Petitioner's SurReply.pdf (7 pages)(4211246 bytes)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Jules Jurgensen/Rhapsody, Inc.,)
Petitioner,	Cancellation No. 92048667
v.	
Peter Baumberger,)
Respondent.	

PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT'S SURREPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR JUDGEMENT

This Response addresses Respondent's mis-statement of the facts concerning the service of its Motion to Strike which was both filed and served electronically on Sunday, August 16, 2009, and its mis-interpretation of Rule 2.119(b).

The facts

Petitioner's Motion to Strike, etc. was served on Respondent <u>electronically</u> and <u>was filed at the T.T.A.B.</u> on August 16, 2009. A <u>courtesy copy</u> was mailed to Respondent.

Since April 7, 2009 (see the attached three emails sent by Respondent on 4/7/2009, 7/20/2009 and 9/8/2009), if not longer, both Petitioner and Respondent have been serving papers on each other electronically. Usually "paper" courtesy copies arrived by mail a few days later. This is specifically noted in Respondent's attached email of 4/7/2009 from Sandy Thoele, sic, "A copy of the attachments will *also* follow by U.S. Mail."

Neither party has objected to or commented on electronic service by the other party.

Thus, by their conduct both Petitioner and Respondent have mutually agreed to the "electronic transmission" of documents as provided for in Rule 2.119(b)(6).

Respondent <u>had actual physical possession</u> of Petitioner's Motion on Monday August 17, 2009. In view of the practice of the parties, the time period for Respondents response to Petitioners Motion began when it actually received the Motion, namely, August 17, 2009.

The period for response expired on September 1, 2009 (fifteen days after service), not September 8, 2009 (an additional five days plus holidays) as claimed by Respondent.

Respondent's reliance on the five day grace period in Rule 2.119(c) is misplaced.

Rule 2.119(c) speaks to the five day grace period only when a paper

".. is served by "first-class mail, 'Express Mail,' or overnight courier."

Thus, the Rule does not apply to electronic (instantaneous service).

Electronic service is analogous to hand delivery. This is because the risk of delay or uncertainty as to the fact of actual receipt of the paper by the recipient is non-existent. Thus, delay and uncertainty of timely delivery is always a possibility with service in the ways cited in the rule.

With electronic delivery, delivery is instant, or not at all.

Clearly, respondent does not claim that it never received the electronically served copy of Petitioner's motion.

Accordingly, its Motion is not well taken and should be denied

Respondent has failed to justify its conduct leading up to the deposition of Mr. Clayman

Respondent has failed to justify its conduct or deny the following facts and events that occurred prior to the deposition of Mr. Clayman:

- 1. On March 4, 2009, before the notice of Mr. Clayman's testimony deposition was drafted, Petitioner's and Respondent's counsel had a telephone conference concerning where and when Mr. Clayman's testimony would be taken, and how Respondent would be represented.
- 2. The notes from Petitioner's counsel's time record for March 4, 2009 as set out below:

"Prepare Notice of Testimony deposition of Morton Clayman, conference with the attorney for Peter Baumberger with respect to when and when the deposition would be taken and how Peter Baumberger would be represented."

- 3. Respondent failed to object to Mr. Clayman's deposition during that telephone conference.
- 4. Respondent cooperated with Petitioner's counsel on the scheduling of Mr. Clayman's deposition.
- 5. Respondent's failed to file a Rule 2. 121(e) motion at any time during the two weeks between the March 4, 2009 conference and the date of Mr. Clayman's deposition.
- 6. The consequence of Respondent's cooperation with Petitioner in the scheduling of Mr. Clayman's deposition, and it's failure to file a motion under Rule 2.121(e):
 - (1) encouraged Petitioner to incur the expense of a court reporter and

(2) interfered with Mr. Clayman's running of his business,

while it sat quietly waiting to pounce with its motion to strike.

7. That at least the day before Mr. Clayman's deposition there was at least one more telephone conference between Respondent's and Petitioner's counsel during which Respondent's counsel disclosed that it would attend the deposition by telephone.

Accordingly, Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration should be granted, and the Order Striking Mr. Clayman's deposition be reversed and withdrawn.

Jules Jurgensen/Rhapsody, Inc.

/Stuart E. Beck/ Stuart B. Beck, Esq.

The Beck Law Firm 1500 Walnut Street, Suite 700 Philadelphia, PA 19102-3504

Tel: (215) 568-6000 Fax: (215) 568-0403

Email: BeckPatent@aol.com

The undersigned Certifies that on October 2, 2009 Petitioner's Response to Respondent's Surreply In Support of Motion for Judgement was sent by email to Andrea Anderson, the attorney for the Respondent at Aanderson@hollandhart.com, and by first class mail, postage prepaid at:

Holland & Hart One Boulder 1800 Broadway, Suite 300 Boulder, CO 80302

/Stuart E. Beck/
Stuart B. Beck, Esq.

Subj:

Jules Jurgensen/Rhapsody, Inc. v. Peter Baumberger, TTAB Cancellation No. 92048667

Date:

4/7/2009 5:37:57 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time

From:

SThoele@hollandhart.com BeckPatent@aol.com

To: CC:

ACHaselfeld@hollandhart.com, aanderson@hollandhart.com, CShearer@hollandhart.com

Dear Mr. Beck:

Attached please find the following which were filed today in the above-referenced matter :

- Motion to Strike Testimony of Morton Clayman;
- 2. Declaration of Annie Chu Haselfeld in Support of Motion to Strike Testimony of Morton Clayman; and
- 3. Exhibits A through E to the Declaration.

A copy of the attachments will also follow by U.S. Mail.

Sincerely,

Sandy Thoele Assistant to Annie Chu Haselfeld Holland & Hart LLP One Boulder Plaza 1800 Broadway, Suite 300 Boulder, CO 80302 Phone (303) 473-2716 Fax (303) 473-2720

E-mail: sthoele@hollandhart.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is confidential and may be privileged. If you believe that this email has been sent to you in error, please reply to the sender that you received the message in error; then please delete this e-mail. Thank you.



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

Subj:

Jules Jurgensen/Rhapsody, Inc. v. Peter Baumberger -- Cancellation No. 92048667

Date:

7/20/2009 12:56:17 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time

From:

aanderson@hollandhart.com

To:

beckpatent@aol.com

CC:

aanderson@hollandhart.com, ACHaselfeld@hollandhart.com

See attached Motion for Judgment Under Trademark Rule 2.132(a) which we filed with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board on July 20, 2009.

Thank you.

Heidi L. Macy Legal Assistant Holland & Hart LLP 1800 Broadway, Suite 300 Boulder, Colorado 80302 Phone: 303-473-2860

Email: hlmacy@hollandhart.com



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is confidential and may be privileged. If you believe that this email has been sent to you in error, please reply to the sender that you received the message in error; then please delete this e-mail. Thank you.

Untitled Document Page 1 of 1

Subi:

Cancellation No. 92048667

Date:

9/8/2009 1:37:01 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time

From: To: CShearer@hollandhart.com beckpatent@aol.com

CC:

aanderson@hollandhart.com

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

HOLLAND&HART.

Dear Mr. Beck:

Please see attached Reply in Support of Motion for Judgment and Opposition to Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration and Receipt.

Chris Shearer

E. Christine Shearer, CLA *IP Specialist*Holland & Hart LLP
1800 Broadway, Suite 300
Boulder, CO 80302
Phone: (303) 473-2719

Phone: (303) 473-2719 Fax: (303) 727-5834

E-mail: cshearer@hollandhart.com

IPH²

Intellectual Property Group at Holland & Hart LLP

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is confidential and may be privileged. If you believe that this email has been sent to you in error, please reply to the sender that you received the message in error; then please delete this e-mail. Thank you.

IPH2. COM